

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 remain in this application. Claim 1 has been amended.

Claim 11 has been added.

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. The Specification has been to correct some mistakes. The objection to Claim 1 has been noted and Claim 1 has now been amended in a manner that it is believed overcomes this objection.

Claims 1-5 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the reference to Mason. The structure of Mason is not a template as is claimed in the present application. Therefore, the structure of Mason could not be used for the same purpose as the structure of the present application. It cannot be used to cut a same sized piece of meat repeatedly. Claim 1 has now been amended to define that the graspable handle is composed of a planar forefinger abutting section and a thumb rest section which are separated by a crease. The forefinger abutting section is deflected at the crease at an angle to the thumb rest section. No such forefinger abutting section or thumb rest section is shown or taught by Mason. Additionally, Mason does not show or teach any such crease between a forefinger abutting section and a thumb rest section.

Additionally, Claim 1 has defined that the guide plate is integrally attached to the thumb rest section at an elongated lineal bend. No such lineal bend is defined between a guide plate that is integrally attached to a thumb rest section at an elongated lineal bend

is shown or taught within Mason. Additionally, the first guide bar is defined in Claim 1 as being attached to the guide plate directly adjacent this lineal bend. Again, no such structure is shown or suggested by Mason. Therefore, it is believed that independent Claim 1 defines allowable subject matter and that Claim 1 should be allowed. Upon Claim 1 being allowed, it is believed that dependent Claims 2-5 will also be allowed. Additionally, the non-elected claims of 6-10 should now be allowed since they depend directly and indirectly from a generic claim, that being Claim 1. According to MPEP 809.02(e) "Whenever a generic claim is found to be allowable in substance ... action on the species claim shall thereupon be given ... . It is therefore believed that the dependent Claims 6-10 should also be allowed.

Claim 11, which has been added, which is dependent from Claim 1, further defines that the angle of deflection between the thumb rest section and the forefinger abutting section is within ten to fifteen degrees. Such an angle deviation is nowhere suggested by Mason and it is therefore believed that Claim 11 defines allowable subject matter.

The additional prior art that has been made of record and not relied upon has been noted.

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and arguments presented herein, it is believed that the claims as now submitted clearly define allowable subject matter over the references of record. It is courteously requested that this application be reconsidered, such reconsideration being favorable resulting in passing of this application to issue.

Amendment to CUTTING TEMPLATE FOR CUTTING MEAT PIECES  
Zachary A. Lundin, inventor  
Serial No. 10/613,134  
Filed July 3, 2003  
Page 9 of 9

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which  
may be required, or credit any overpayment to account No. 13-4899.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JACK C. MUNRO, Patent Agent  
Registration No. 22,979

28720 Roadside Drive - Suite 225  
Agoura Hills, CA 91301  
phone: (818) 991-1687  
fax: (818) 889-0116